

REMARKS

Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-18 as being anticipated by the application to Horvitz (US 2004/0002932). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Official Action, the Examiner asserts that Hovitz discloses the features of claim 1 of the present application. Claim 1 of present application reads:

1. An automatic video summarizer comprising:

*an input unit for receiving **a video source to be summarized** and a desired summarization time from a user;*

*an importance measurement module for generating importance degrees according to category characteristics of the video and a **purpose of desired summary**;*
and

*a video summarization generation module for **applying shot information** and an importance value to a characteristic support vector algorithm, and **generating a video summary**.*
(emphasis added)

The Examiner directs our attention to paragraph [0027] lines 10-23 of Horvitz as evidence. The text in question reads “The items 20 can include substantially any **type of message or notification** such as voice messages, web information, e-mails, pager information, and so forth. The learning algorithms 30 analyze one or more attributes (described/illustrated below) of a respective item 20 to automatically determine such characteristics as **an urgency or priority of the item to the user**. For example, the learning algorithms 30 can include employment of classifiers that are configured to analyze associated attributes of the items 20, wherein a feature vector assigns a weight or value to the attribute based upon learning processes applied to training members or data of the attribute's class or topic. Classifiers can be stated as a function that maps an input attribute to the confidence that the input belongs to a class...” (emphasis added)

The cited text does not mention “a video source to be summarized”, “a desired summarization time from a user”, “applying shot information”, or “generating a video summary”. Those features from the claims are not taught or suggested in any part of Horvitz as far as the Applicants can determine.

Horvitz uses weighted attributes to determine which and when various items (such as email) are presented to the user (see e.g. paragraph [0027] lines 10-13, stating “The items 20 can include substantially **any type of message or notification** such as voice messages, web information, e-mails, pager information, and so forth”) (emphasis added). There is no discussion in Horvitz of generating a summary of any type of data, much less a video summary as recited in the claims. Horvitz does not concern itself with the subject matter of the claims – using a “*characteristic support vector algorithm*” for “*generating video summaries*” based on “*importance degrees according to the video’s category characteristic and a purpose of desired summary*”.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Horvitz.

Claims 2-7 are patentable over Horvitz at least for the reason that they depend upon claim 1.

Claim 8 is patentable over Horvitz for the same reasons, *mutatis mutandis*, given for claim 1.

Claims 9-12 are patentable over Horvitz at least for the reason that they depend upon claim 8.

Claim 13 is patentable over Horvitz for the same reasons, *mutatis mutandis*, given for claim 1.

Claims 14-15 are patentable over Horvitz at least for the reason that they depend upon claim 13.

Claim 16 is patentable over Horvitz for the same reasons, *mutatis mutandis*, given for claim 1.

Claims 17-18 are patentable over Horvitz at least for the reason that they depend upon claim 16.

Therefore, claims 1-18 are all patentable over Horvitz.

The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of anticipation be withdrawn for all the claims.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

December 6, 2010
(Date of Transmission)

Cait Yocum
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Cait Yocum/
(Signature)

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cash 60546/

Brian J. Cash
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,546
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 fax
bcash@la.ladas.com